

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/509,409	09/23/2004	Christoph Gerard August Hoelen	NL 020264	8032
	7590 01/24/2008	EXAMINER		
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS P.O. BOX 3001			LEE, Y MY QUACH	
BRIARCLIFF	BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
;			2885	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/24/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		80				
e	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summany	10/509,409	HOELEN ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Lee Y Quach	2885				
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	n appears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR R WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILIN  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 C after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory p  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	IG DATE OF THIS COMMUNION FR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a son. period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON statute, cause the application to become AB	CATION. reply be timely filed NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	31 October 2007.					
· · _ ·						
·	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 1,3 and 7-20 is/are pending in the 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with 5) ⊠ Claim(s) 17-20 is/are allowed.  6) ⊠ Claim(s) 1, 3, 7-9 and 13-16 is/are rejected 7) ⊠ Claim(s) 10-12 is/are objected to.  8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction as	hdrawn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Exa	miner.					
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐	] accepted or b) ☐ objected to	by the Examiner.				
Applicant may not request that any objection to	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the control of the control	•					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority docur 2. Certified copies of the priority docur 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International But * See the attached detailed Office action for a	ments have been received. ments have been received in A priority documents have been ureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	application No received in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)	•					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	· ·	Summary (PTO-413)				
<ol> <li>Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-94)</li> <li>Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)</li> <li>Paper No(s)/Mail Date</li> </ol>		s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application 				

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 08-06) Application/Control Number: 10/509,409

Art Unit: 2885

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

### Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed October 31, 2007 have been considered. However, upon further consideration, a new ground of rejection is made in view of Osumi (JP 2001-281456).

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

3. Claims 1, 7, 8, 13, 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Osumi (JP 2001-281456, prior art previously cited).

Osumi shows a light emitting panel (14, figure 2) comprising a front wall (14B), a rear wall (14C) situated opposite to the front wall, a first edge surface (14A) being light transmitted, a second edge surface (14F) opposite the first edge surface such that the second edge surface is reflecting with respect to light inside the panel, the surface of the second edge surface having a specularly or diffusely reflecting material (17), a ratio of the surface area S<sub>1</sub> of the first edge (the vertical surface area of the first edge) and the largest cross section  $S_{lsc}$  (the largest vertical cross section of the second edge) in the light emitting panel substantially parallel to the first edge surface satisfying the relation 1 <  $S_{lcs}/S_1 < 10$  (figure 2, the largest vertical cross section of the second edge is about 3 times larger than the first vertical surface area, the ratio is 3 to 1 which is within the ratio as claimed), at least a first light source (15) associated with the first edge surface, the light source comprising at least two light emitting diodes with different light emission wavelengths (15A, 15B), light originating from the first light source incident on the first edge surface and distributed in the panel, the panel widens over a widening section from the first edge surface in a direction towards the second edge surface (figure 2A and 2B), the rear wall provided over the widening section with a plurality of steps (14E) of which a surface facing the front wall is substantially parallel to the front wall, a further surface (14D) of the steps making an angle ( $\theta_1$ ) of 45 degrees with respect to a normal on the

Application/Control Number: 10/509,409

Art Unit: 2885

front wall which is within the range of  $48 < \beta < -48$ , and a display device comprising a liquid crystal display (LCD 2).

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 5. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Osumi (JP 2001-281456, prior art previously cited).

Osumi discloses the invention substantially as claimed with the exception of having the ratio as claimed in 3.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to include Osumi with the ratio as claimed so that light can be optimally conducted within the light emitting panel to evenly distribute and enhance the light qualities across the light emitting surface, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skilled in the art. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233.

6. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Osumi (JP 2001-281456, prior art previously cited) in view of Lammers (prior art previously cited).

Osumi discloses the invention substantially as claimed with the exception of having the front wall provided with a translucent diffuser.

Lammers teaches that it is known in the art to have the front wall provided with a translucent diffuser.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to provide the front wall of Osumi with a translucent diffuser, as shown by Lammers, to diffuse and uniform the light coupled out from wall.

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Osumi (JP 2001-281456, prior art previously cited) in view of Lammers (prior art previously cited).

Osumi discloses the invention substantially as claimed with the exception of having the light emitting diode at least 5 lm.

Art Unit: 2885

Lammers teaches that it is known in the art to use light emitting diode having at least 5 lm (column 9, lines 2 to 3) in light emitting panel display device.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to provide the light emitting diode of Osumi with at least 5 lm, as shown by Lammers, for the advantage of enabling the light to be coupled into the light emitting panel with a higher efficiency, hardly emitting heat as well as issuing detrimental radiation, and to overall provide a compact illumination system.

- 7. Claims 10 to 12 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
- 8. Claims 17 to 20 are allowed.

#### Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Y Quach Lee whose telephone number is 571-272-2373. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Thursday from 8:30 am to 2:30 pm.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the customer service 571-272-2815.

Y. Q. January 17, 2008

Y Quach Lee Primary Examiner Art Unit 2885